

*Defence of Canada Regulations*

more weight to my argument. Of course, I did not say that the order or instruction was sent to him. They are sent to every newspaper in the country, and there was certainly an order of the kind. The hon. gentleman simply said something that might have been said by anybody in the country without offence to anybody and without injury to anybody or to the progress of the war. But just because he said that, it was stated by a minister of the crown that Hitler was the leader of the opposition's latest recruit. I repeated that myself, and I confess I did wrong to say a thing like that about the hon. gentleman because he simply mentioned a fact that was known to all of us, and by so doing, of course, he was not recruiting Hitler into the Tory party. Nobody can now be blamed for doing the same thing the hon. gentleman did because this particular order was afterwards cancelled. So that there is no guilt about it. But my conclusion is this, that we must not lack a sense of proportion in our interpretation of the defence regulations.

I regret that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) is leaving the chamber because I was just going to say something about him. I think he completely lacked a sense of proportion when he suggested that we should worship a man like Sir Stafford Cripps. I do not think he is worse than anyone else; but why should anyone worship anyone else in this world? Such an attitude prevents criticism. I would tell the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart that the brightest lady journalist of America, a lady whose pen is much sharper than that of Dorothy Thompson, Miss Judith Robinson, has expressed her views about Sir Stafford Cripps in all fairness, and she pokes a little bit of fun at him. That is no offence, any more than it was an offence for the leader of the opposition to say what he did about the empire air training scheme. Miss Judith Robinson wrote in the *News of Toronto*, of March 14:

Enthusiasts for change-any-place-but-Ottawa are doing a lot to drown Sir Stafford Cripps' real virtues in pails of gush over attributes he hasn't and never has had. The new leader of the British House of Commons is not a "winning personality." He has a face like a stage undertaker's and a manner like a high church curate's. He is not a great speaker. He is repetitive and addicted to second-hand phrases. He is not, despite a snob-souled local press's blarney, "an aristocrat." He is the son of a wealthy man whose father made money in shipping.

Sir Stafford would be frank to admit that no English business men ever pursued profit further from the aristocratic ideal of noblesse oblige, or from ordinary human compassion for that matter, than did the big shipmasters of the nineteenth century.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

He would admit it because honesty is a virtue he possesses in his own right, not his ancestors'. He has other virtues that should prove useful to England at this hour; an unswerving purpose, a logical mind, cold judgment and a great lack of pity for incompetents, however well-paid and influential. Canadian sentimentalists who have been cooing—

That is fine.

—over Sir Stafford "the labour aristocrat", might spend their time better trying to guess whose fault it is that Ottawa is as short of Crippses as it is short of Churchills.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does he not think there is a difference between poking fun at ourselves, or having a member of the family poke fun at us, and having a guest poke fun at us?

Mr. POULIOT: I am a little hard of hearing. If my hon. friend will repeat what he said I shall be thankful to him.

Mr. COLDWELL: I ask my hon. friend if he did not think there was a difference between having a member of our own family poke fun at another member of the family and having an uninvited guest poke fun at a member of the family? I think there is a big difference there.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not a matter of guests; it is a matter of judgment on a man who plays an important role in politics at the present time. But because a politician is not a member of our House of Commons does not mean that we have not a right to pass judgment on his qualifications. Besides that, I wonder what has happened to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart; for a certain time he has been burning incense under the noses of people who are too far away to smell the perfume.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is very good.

Mr. POULIOT: Speaking of perfume, I hold in my hand that reputable paper, the *New York Times*, Monday, October 27, 1941. It is a good paper and full of information. Here, on page 3, I see an item which has passed both the British and United States censors and has reached the newsroom of the *Times* and its readers:

London, Oct. 26 (U.P.)—Viscount Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, came in to-day for another drubbing for a recent speech in which he said that Britain was in no position to invade the continent.

"His very name stinks in my nostrils," Robert Gegoed, former chairman of the Northern Ireland Labour party, said at a conference in Belfast. He spoke in support of a resolution demanding Lord Halifax's resignation.

That is from London. It is too bad that the perfume of the incense was not effective